

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/119,299 07/20/98 YAMADA 5 JA9-97-025 **EXAMINER** LM02/0622 GREGORY M DOUDNIKOFF KUMAR, S IBM CORP DEPT T81/BLDG 062 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER PO BOX 12195 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK NC 27709 *271*5 **DATE MAILED:**

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

06/22/00

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/119,299**

Applicant(s)

Yamada et al

Examiner

Srilakshmi Kumar

Group Art Unit 2775



Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
☐ This action is FINAL .	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay/1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire3 month longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained 37 CFR 1.136(a).	or response will cause the
Disposition of Claim	·
	is/are pending in the applicat
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration
Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
X Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 11	is/are rejected.
X Claim(s) <u>2, 5, 7, 10, and 12</u>	is/are objected to.
☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner. The proposed drawing correction, filed on is approved	
	•
Attachment(s) XI Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	,
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)	
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	
	•
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES	

Art Unit: 2775

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a) (d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/119,299, filed on July 20,
 1998.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 4,6, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saigh (US 5,734,891).

As to independent claims 1, 4, 9, 11, Saigh discloses a display unit for displaying data, Fig. 1, item 48, cursor control means for displaying a mouse cursor at a coordinate location, Fig. 3, items 62, 64, 66, 68, scroll control means for scrolling data, Fig. 12, item 130 and scrolling speed display means for displaying a number of speed indicators as shown by Col. 16, lines 55-65. Although Saigh does not explicitly state a pointing device, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that this feature could have been present. Saigh states in Col. 1, lines 48-50 that various controls for manipulation of the display are known in the art. The pointing device is advantageous as it allows for ease in data manipulation for the user.

Application/Control Number: 09/119,299 Page 3

Art Unit: 2775

As to dependent claim 6, see claim 4 above.

4. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saigh as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Moseley et al. (Microsoft Office 97, Professional Edition).

As to dependent claim 3, limitations of claim 1 and further comprising a means for changing a displayed image of the mouse cursor in response to whether a specific button of said pointing device is clicked or released. Where Saigh fails to teach the feature, Moseley et al show in Page 120, last paragraph under Mouse Pointer where the cursor changes from an I-beam to a white pointing arrow depending upon the button pressed. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that this feature could have easily been adapted into the Saigh system as it identifies to the user whether the mouse is in pointing or typing mode.

As to dependent claim 8, limitations of claim 4 and further comprising where mouse cursor is displayed only during a data scrolling operation. Where Saigh fails to teach this feature, Moseley et al show in Page 120, 1st paragraph and Page 121, 1st paragraph (tip section), where the mouse cursor is displayed during data scrolling. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that this feature could have easily been adapted into the Saigh system as displaying the mouse cursor would illustrate where the movement of the scrolling as well as the area where the scrolling is halted and is ready for entry.

Allowable Subject Matter

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/119,299

Art Unit: 2775

5. Claims 2, 5, 7, 10 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to claims 2, 5, 7, 10 and 12, the prior art of record fail to show the detail of where the speed indicators are arranged relative to a center of the mouse cursor in a scrolling direction and where the mouse cursor body does not move during scrolling.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kent (US 5,528,260) discloses a method and apparatus for proportional auto-scrolling.

Takinami (US 6,016,110) discloses a map display device, map display method, automobile and navigation device.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 09/119,299 Page 5

Art Unit: 2775

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Srilakshmi Kumar** whose telephone number is (703) **306-5575**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Saras, can be reached on (703) 305-9720. The fax number is (703) 308-6606.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

June 16, 2000

STEVEN J. SARAS
CURRENVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

GROUP 2700